

Appln. No.: 09/963,324
Amendment Dated March 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2005

MATP-611US

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-14 and 16-18 are pending in the above-identified application. Claim 15 was cancelled.

Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 13-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Luchaup and Varney, Jr. This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, neither Luchaup, Varney, Jr., nor their combination disclose "a codec for compressing the utterance" and "a further codec for decompressing the compressed utterance," as required by claim 1. As described in the previous Office Action, Luchaup does not disclose or suggest compressing the audio signal before sending it to the host device or decompressing the audio signal at the host device before converting the audio signal to a command. At page 4 of the Office Action, Examiner agrees with Applicants, reciting that "Luchaup does not teach compressing the utterance at the remote control unit and decompressing the utterance at the relay station. Examiner further recites that "Varney teaches a system for remote voice control that acquires and codes a voice command at the controller and sends this information to a base station which is decoded for recognition."

While Applicants agree that Varney, Jr. encodes a voice command, the invention in Varney, Jr. does not disclose or suggest **compressing** the audio signal. In particular, Varney, Jr. uses a continuously variable delta slope modulator (CVSD) to digitize the analog voice signal and then encodes the digitized signal using Manchester encoding. There is no suggestion in either of these references that either CVSD or Manchester encoding compresses the voice signal. CVSD is a well known digitization technique. Manchester encoding is defined as "binary phase encoding in which the time interval assigned to each bit is divided in half by a transition whose direction determines the value of the bit." (American National Standard Dictionary of Information Technology (ANSDIT), http://www.incits.org/tc_home/k5htm/m1.htm). Two bits are used to encode one information bit within a time interval. Thus, the encoding used in Varney, Jr. does not compress the signal being sent. In contrast, more information is being transmitted within the signal because two-bits of the Manchester encoded signal are sent for each bit of the digitized voice signal. Thus, Varney Jr. disclose expanding the signal and not compressing it as required by claim 1 of the subject invention.

As described in paragraph [0035] of the specification, the present invention compresses the audio signal before sending it to the relay station. As described in the previous response,

Page 2 of 4

AppIn. No.: 09/963,324
Amendment Dated March 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2005

MATP-611US

compressing the audio signal provides the advantage of being able to transmit the signal in a shorter time interval. Varney, Jr. does not describe any compression of the audio signal and, so, can not provide the advantage of the subject invention.

Accordingly, claim 1 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup and Varney, Jr. Claims 3, 7 and 8 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, these claims are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup and Varney, Jr. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

With regard to claims 13 and 17, while not identical to claim 1, claims 13 and 17 include features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Thus, claims 13 and 17 are also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 1. Claim 14 depends from claim 13. Accordingly, claim 14 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup and Varney, Jr. for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Douglas. This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Luchaup and Varney, Jr. are described above. Douglas is described in the previous response. Douglas also does not disclose or suggest "a codec for compressing the utterance" and "a further codec for decompressing the compressed utterance," as required by claim 1. Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 2 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Douglas for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 4-6 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Mingot et al. This ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. Luchaup and Varney, Jr. are described above. As described in the previous response, Mignot et al. also does not disclose or suggest "a codec for compressing the utterance" and "a further codec for decompressing the compressed utterance," as required by claim 1. Claims 4-6 and 9 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 4-6 and 9 are also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Mingot et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Kolde et al. With regard to claim 16, this ground for rejection is respectfully traversed. In particular, neither Luchaup, Varney, Jr., Kolde et al. nor their

Appln. No.: 09/963,324
Amendment Dated March 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2005

MATP-611US

combination disclose or suggest "a codec for compressing the utterance" and "a further codec for decompressing the compressed utterance," as required by claim 16. Luchaup and Varney, Jr. are described above. Kolde et al. is described in the previous Office action. Kolde et al. do not disclose or suggest any compression or decompression of the audio signal. Accordingly, Kolde et al. do not provide the material that is missing from Luchaup and Varney, Jr. Thus, claim 16 is not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Luchaup, Varney, Jr. and Kolde et al.

With regard to claims 18, while not identical to claim 16, claim 18 includes features similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 16. Thus, claim 18 is also not subject to rejection for the same reasons as those set forth above with regard to claim 16.

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 10-12.

The prior art made of record but not applied has been considered but does not affect the patentability of the invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-9, 13-14 and 16-18.

Respectfully submitted,


Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549
Attorney for Applicant

KNN/pb

Dated: March 14, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482

(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (1-571-273-8300) on the date shown below.

March 14, 2006


Patricia C. Bocella

PCB_I:\MATP\611USVAMEND03.14.06.DOC